



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,995	07/24/2003	Bjame Nilsen	2137JB.45692	9903
7590	05/02/2006		EXAMINER	
Bracewell & Patterson, L.L.P. P.O. Box 61389 Houston, TX 77208-1389			CHAUDHRY, SAEED T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,995

Applicant(s)

NILSEN, BJARNE

Examiner

Saeed T. Chaudhry

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments and remarks filed February 16, 2006 have been acknowledged by the examiner and entered. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application for consideration. Of the above claims 9 and 10 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of claims 1-8 has been withdrawn in view of amendments and remarks filed February 16, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.

Claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eriksson in view of JP-2001096241.

Eriksson (6,888,631) disclose a method for cleaning and monitoring window (i.e. a light-transmissive and light reflective surface of oil production system) by flushing away deposits from the window surface by intermittently flushing methanol through a nozzle 10. The nozzle 10 is mounted downstream of the window 5 and direct high pressure spray. In the case where there is a multiplicity of cameras each with its own window, then each such window would be provided with its respective such nozzle (see col. 4, lines 26-36). The reference fails to use ozone for flushing.

Art Unit: 1746

JP-2001096241 disclose a method for removing organic material from a glass substrate such as quartz glass, liquid-crystal glass by washing with ozone water solution. The concentration of ozonic water is made to be 5 ppm or higher. (see abstract).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed process to utilize ozone water solution as disclosed by Jp-2001096241 into the process of Eriksson for the purpose of removing organic material such as oil contamination from the surface of the light-transmissive window. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art expect that ozone water solution remove organic material such as photo-mask would remove other organic material such as oil contaminants.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eriksson in view of JP-2001096241 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Langford or Rosenauer.

Eriksson and JP-2001096241 were discussed supra. However, the references fail to disclose a source of flushing fluid comprising a reservoir of flushing fluid and means for generating ozone and mixing the ozone and flushing fluid.

Langford (5,207,237) and Rosenauer (5,641,456) disclose ozone generator and mixer for the ozone and water (see claims, and abstract).

It is well known in the art to generate ozone and mix with water to form a ozone solution for cleaning as disclosed by Langford and Rosenauer. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed process for flushing reflective surface with ozone water solution to include ozone generator and mixer as disclosed by Langford and Rosenauer in the process of Eriksson for generating ozone solution near the point of use because ozone is known to deplete in short time efficient cleaning because ozone is known to deplete in short time.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver et al in view of JP-2001096241.

Weaver et al (4,896,047) disclose a method for cleaning windows of light-transmissive and light reflective surface in contact with a oil-fire plant by spraying a volatile nonflammable cleaning solvent onto each of the windows. A cleaning substance that may be used is water (see col. 3, lines 21-30).

JP-2001096241 disclose a method for removing organic material from a glass substrate such as quartz glass, liquid-crystal glass by washing with ozone water solution. The concentration of ozonic water is made to be 5 ppm or higher. (see abstract).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed process to utilize ozone water solution as disclosed by JP-2001096241 into the process of Weaver et al for the purpose of removing organic material such as oil contamination from the surface of the light-transmissive window. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art expect that ozone water solution remove organic material such as photo-mask as disclosed by JP-2001096241 would remove other organic material such as oil contaminants.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver in view of JP-2001096241 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Langford or Rosenauer.

All the reference were discussed supra. However, Weaver et al and JP-2001096241 references fail to disclose a source of flushing fluid comprising a reservoir of flushing fluid and means for generating ozone and mixing the ozone and flushing fluid.

Langford (5,207,237) and Rosenauer (5,641,456) disclose ozone generator and mixer for the ozone and water (see claims, and abstract).

It is well known in the art to generate ozone and mix with water to form a ozone solution for cleaning as disclosed by Langford and Rosenauer. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed process for flushing reflective surface with ozone water solution to include ozone generator and mixer as disclosed by Langford and Rosenauer in the process of Weaver et al for generating ozone solution near the point of use because ozone is known to deplete in short time.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argued that according to the translation of JP-2001096241, the structures that are cleaned using the ozone water solution are immersed or soaked in the ozone water solution for a period of time, about five minutes as disclosed. In each and every example, the object being cleaned was immersed into a solution, or soaking in a solution for a period of time of five minutes. There is no disclosure that the liquid would be suitable for cleaning by ejecting from a nozzle, in which there is not prolonged and sustained exposure like soaking.

These arguments are not persuasive because JP-2001096241 discloses that “the shower Ling’s method which hangs a penetrant remover in a shower etc., the approach which combined them further are mentioned from the former as a method which washes a precision substrate using the penetrant remover of this invention. That is, the washing approach of this invention is not limited and can apply especially the washing method to any method (see paragraph 31 of the translation). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would use ozone water of JP-2001096241 into the methods of Eriksson or weaver et al by spraying rather than being immersed into the solution since JP-2001096241 suggested that the invention is not limited to immersing.

Art Unit: 1746

Applicant's arguments filed February 16, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeed T. Chaudhry whose telephone number is (571) 272-1298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Barr, can be reached on (571)-272-1414. The fax phone number for non-final is (703)-872-9306.

When filing a FAX in Gp 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Saeed T. Chaudhry
Patent Examiner



MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER